

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. VII

NEW YORK, APRIL 25, 1914

No. 24

In the last issue I dealt with an article by Professor Robert N. Corwin, Chairman of the Committee on Entrance Examinations of the Sheffield Scientific School, printed in the Yale Alumni Weekly for March 20. It was a pleasure to incorporate in that editorial some remarks by the New York Times. We owe still more to this journal for two further discussions of Professor Corwin's letter which have appeared in its editorial columns.

Under the title, Answering a Foe of Latin, The New York Times, on Saturday, April 4, in one of its minor editorials, wrote as follows:

A reader who evidently doesn't think much of Latin as a part of modern education makes against some recent commendation of that language, printed on this page¹, the point that the commendation itself had to be, or at any rate was, expressed in words the greater number of which were not of Latin origin. Selecting a single passage, he finds in it twenty-two Latin words and sixty-six that would be called Anglo-Saxon. So he wants to know what warrant there was for calling Latin "the muscular part" of English.

On looking over these lists one notices that the shorter one contains not a single duplication, while the other has so many that if they were removed it would cease to be the longer. Yet our critic insists that the Anglo-Saxon words were those that gave "motion and driving power" to the sentences he analysed—that, therefore, they were the "muscular part" and Latin merely the bones.

We cannot ourselves see it in that way. There is not much "motion and driving power" in such words as "is", "a", "and", "but", "it", "the", "of", "to", "there", "shall" and "should", "that", "whose", "still", and "nevertheless", and the like. Yet these words comprise the bulk of the non-Latin words which our correspondent groups together.

There is a lot of what Mayor Mitchell calls "bunk and moonshine" in the talk about pure Anglo-Saxon. In the 513,000 words presented by the Standard Dictionary in its latest edition, a few thousand only are Anglo-Saxon, and of these the ones most frequently used are of the kind that make the skeleton of the language—the very articles and connectives which our critic has enumerated. Within this flexible skeleton, material has been assimilated from almost every language under the sun to make up the real meat and tissue of English. The bulk of the importations, however, has been from Latin and its offshoots, French, Spanish, and Italian. Some of the short Saxon words are pithy and expressive, but often for sheer power and always for variety of expression the Latin is superior.

Attention may be called here to an elaborate analysis of the Latin element in English, printed in The Literary Digest for January 25, 1913, and incorporated by Professor Lodge in an editorial in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 6.137-138.

On Sunday, April 5, under the caption The Latin Requirement, The Times took up again, editorially, the letter of Professor Corwin. We give the editorial in full:

That the four-year Latin requirement for admission to Yale College "has now become almost unique"; that most of the high schools "except those within Yale's sphere of influence" have either dropped or sidetracked this subject, and that Yale is restricting admission from the high schools, and in consequence snobbishly encouraging admission from the special fitting schools, was the contention of the Chairman of the Committee on Entrance Examinations in the Sheffield Scientific School, printed in the Yale Alumni Weekly, of March 27. Some one has gone after and searched these statements, and in the current issue of the Yale Alumni Weekly the facts are produced.

Examining the catalogues of twenty-one of the leading older endowed institutions with which Yale is classed, it is found that Dartmouth, Williams, Amherst, Boston, Brown, Columbia, Princeton, and Johns Hopkins have the four-year Latin entrance requirement; that five of the women's colleges, Wellesley, Mount Holyoke, Smith, Vassar, and Bryn Mawr, maintain it; and three years' preparation in Latin is required at Harvard, Bowdoin, and Trinity. Tufts requires two years. Only two universities, Cornell and Pennsylvania, confer the B.A. degree with Latin as an elective. At Bowdoin and Harvard, which require only three years' preparation, it is found that 60 per cent. of the candidates for the class of 1917 presented the full four years.

"Dead" Latin is not so moribund it seems, as Greek. The high schools furnished students at the nine colleges entering with the four-year requirement in quotas ranging from 25 per cent at Princeton to 60 per cent. at Columbia, 70 per cent. at Dartmouth, and 80 per cent. and more at Amherst. If these pupils come within "Yale's sphere of influence", certainly the five or six thousand students at women's colleges, all of whom must have a four-year course, are not within that influence. The girls come from all over the country. While 48 per cent. of the new students at Vassar during the last four years were from public high schools, only 41 per cent. were prepared at private schools, the remainder having had training at both. At Wellesley 64 per cent. of the two lower classes were high school pupils, 32 per cent. from the private schools; at Smith the proportions are 63 per cent. and 30 per cent. among sophomores, which is about the average for all women's colleges.

¹ The reference is to the remarks on Aristocracy and Latin from the Times in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 7.178.

At Mount Holyoke 82 per cent. of the students come from the high schools.

As a component part of the English language, Latin is very much alive—a fact that the schools and colleges seem to realize. It will not do for the opponents of its study to make reckless and ignorant statements about it.

C. K.

CORRESPONDENCE

May I make a brief reply to some of the strictures made upon my paper?

About the Introductions, I confess myself overwhelmed. Under such conditions as you describe, they are an obvious necessity. I should like, however, to call attention to a qualification which I made, not at all as a *captatio benevolentiae*, but in all sincerity. In many school-editions, the condition of having a personal contribution to make has been amply fulfilled. I can testify that from more than one edition I have received abundant information and stimulus.

That Dr. Forbes has totally mistaken my meaning is doubtless my fault. If the Introduction, in the form in which it is generally found, is necessary at all, it cannot well avoid being a compilation. So, to a certain extent is Rohde's *Psyche*, or Croiset's *History of Greek Literature*, as well as the articles in the various Dictionaries. My point is that where Smith or Harper or the *Britannica* is available, the Introduction often adds nothing, even in the matter of exposition. If no one of these is within easy reach, my contention loses its force.

But it was the Notes and the Vocabularies that principally concerned me, and, here again, I have obviously failed to make my position clear. I did not object to the Notes because they are too full or too scanty, too elementary or too erudite, but because they are the wrong kind. They do not seem to me to deal with the difficulties that confront the pupil, and I suggested, quite "constructively", what notes, in my opinion, would deal with these difficulties.

As far as the Vocabularies are concerned, my criticism of them is based upon the very considerations that Dr. Forbes advances. It is because a knowledge of English is not to be presumed, that they are largely futile. We are committed, I take it, to the doctrine that the best way of learning English is by mastering Latin, not by learning lists of English words. If only the simplest meanings are given, as they are in Professor Lodge's vocabulary, the pupil is under compulsion to recast the whole sentence into English, —not merely select a fitting word here and there.

Finally, I feel bitterly aggrieved at Professor McDaniel's comment. Can he really maintain, *ex animi sui sententia*, that I have failed to be specific, or that I have been wholly destructive?

MAX RADIN.

NEWTOWN HIGH SCHOOL, ELMHURST, L. I.

Your editorial of March 14 comes to some of us like a challenge. We talk big, you imply, about teaching Latin as literature, but few of us tell how we actually manage¹. May I take up the gauntlet you have thrown? I teach only preparatory work,

¹ Miss Carver misunderstood, I think, the editorial in question. It was not directed against the vast body of teachers who go silently about their business—but against those who, on the one hand, draw indictments against all—or most teachers—for failure to do their work well, and, on the other themselves fail to show how the desiderated improvement is to be effected.

C. K.

but I like to think I make some of it more than a mere task, and that some, at least, of my pupils enjoy their Vergil as poetry and literature. Here are some of the things I actually do with that end in view.

To begin with, I believe that the class should understand from the start that the *Aeneid* is poetry, that it can be read as poetry, and that it is beautiful music, even if they understand not one word of it. And so we begin to scan the first thing. I used to put off the scanning for a while, and then take it up at odd moments when I had a little extra time. But the class seemed to think the scanning a sort of side-show which they could visit if they had time and money left after seeing the main circus. So now we always spend a week or more upon scansion before doing anything else. I have them work together at the blackboard, I drill on the rules of quantity, I require daily written work, which is carefully corrected and returned, and each day I read a page or two as accurately and rhythmically as I can. In this way I am sure the pupils come to realize that *Arma virumque cano* is not cut by the same pattern as *Gallia est omnis divisa*. I do not try to get the class to read metrically at first. They all learn to scan accurately (and, by the way, I prefer a text with unmarked vowels); all realize that I am reading poetry, and gradually some learn to read well for themselves. Some never do, I admit, but they can't read English poetry either and so I don't worry.

Is this literary training? I think it is. At least I am satisfied when one tells me that he hears the sadness in *Sunt lacrimae rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt*, and when another *sua sponte* catches the lullaby in *suadentque cadentia sidera somnos*. *Tunc ille Aeneas quem Dardanio Anchisae* must be scanned as well as read if beginners are to see in its slow heavy spondee how the poet managed to express Dido's overwhelming wonder. She could talk fast enough when that was gone: *alma Venus Phrygii genuit Simoentis ad undam*.

Surely no translation can do justice to Juno's speech in the first book: *Mene incepto desistere victam*. Her hatred of the Teucris fairly hisses out through those *s's*: her wounded pride comes out with the emphatic *me*. Do you not yourself love to read that passage *Hinc atque hinc vastae rupes scopulique minantur*? How smooth and calm it is after the ruin of the sky which preceded them. Here in the beautiful lines the reader can find rest, even as did the weary ships.

The other day we were reading Dido's speech in Book 4. *Dissimulare etiam sperasti, perfide, tantum?* Those broken sentences, those long lines, those emphatic *me's*, all show poor Dido's distraction, and how can you translate them? Nay, you must read them. "Are you fleeing from me", translated the student. "MENE fugis?" I interrupted. "Is it from me you flee?" he corrected instantly. Did he not give it the literary touch? I don't care if he had seen it so rendered in the notes. He caught the meaning from the reading.

Another thing I do which helps the class to enjoy the work. I read them all the English poetry I can. The story of the *iudicium Paridis* comes first, and Tennyson's *Oenone* tells it beautifully. The same author's *Tithonus* and Vergil, Shelley's *Arethusa*, Longfellow's *Enceladus* and those clever travesties of John G. Saxe are some of the poems I always read. I keep in my school-room desk prose translations of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. I read Homer's

account of how Ulysses and Diomedes stole the horses of Rhesus and how the Trojan women made to the unpropitious Minerva their fruitless sacrifice, Hecuba's fairest robe 'that shone like a star,' and lay nethermost of all'. And I go right on here and read, amid breathless silence, the beautiful farewell of Hector and Andromache. And when the time comes we see crafty Ulysses in the cave of Polyphemus, and hear the Sirens sing their songs on the rocks, or go to the city of the Cimmerians shrouded in mist and cloud, to visit the ruthless Achilles and hear his loving inquiries for his dear son Neoptolemus.

When we read of Andromache sacrificing at the empty tomb of Hector, I always put on the blackboard Catullus's tender lines to his brother, *Multas per gentes et multa per aequora vectus*, and read a verse translation of them. This poem I find a special favorite. Someone, nearly always, asks to be allowed to copy it. I try to find occasion to read a few short Latin poems suggested by something that comes up, two or three of Catullus, Martial's Epigram on the little Erotium, and Horace's Ode to Vergil. And I never forget Ad Maronis Mausoleum.

I try not to talk syntax any more than I can help; most of that ought to be out of the way before the class begins Vergil. But grammar, properly managed, is the handmaid of literature, and should be made to know her place. Think you the student loses the force of *Quis Troiae nesciat urbem* because perchance he recognizes the deliberative subjunctive and can even call it by name? Or that an adjective is less beautiful to him because he knows in just how many ways an adjective may modify a noun? In *aeternum servans sub pectore vulnus*, is *aeternum* an attributive modifier or a predicate accusative? I do not know, but it makes a difference, and for myself I prefer the latter, 'keeping the wound unhealed'. You see, she didn't want it to heal.

We have a fairly good College library and I require two sets of essays during the year. These are read before the class and are greatly enjoyed by all except the performer for the day. The first subjects deal with the private life of the Romans, their houses, their public buildings, the games, education, clothing and the like. The others send the student to consult such books as Glover's Vergil, Fowler's Religious Experience of the Roman People, or Geikie's Love of Nature among the Romans. This may seem more like work than literature, but I think it adds interest and shows the students that the Aeneid is a great work of art, worthy the attention of the ablest men.

These, Mr. Editor, are some of the things I do to make my classes love their Vergil. If I succeed with only part of them, have I not taught it as literature and not as a job to be gotten through with as quickly and cheaply as possible? Honestly, only one man ever told me he disliked Vergil.

VALPARAISO UNIVERSITY,
VALPARAISO, INDIANA.

KATHERINE E. CARVER.

THE PHILADELPHIA SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF LIBERAL STUDIES

The meeting which was held in Philadelphia on Saturday, March 14, for the purpose of organizing a local Society for the Promotion of Liberal Studies in general, and for the support of the Classics in particular, fully confirmed the belief of the Commit-

tee that the appeal of such an organization would be strongly felt in this vicinity.

More than two hundred and fifty persons responded to the invitation which had gone out in individual notices and through the columns of our invaluable CLASSICAL WEEKLY. While the classical teachers, of course, constituted a majority in this company, other departments were well represented and there was even a sprinkling of persons who were not professionally interested. It was a matter of special satisfaction to find the English teachers willing to join hands with us in this movement, since in their classes, particularly, we look for the fruitage of the classical seed.

The morning session was opened by Dr. Walter Dennison who, as chairman of the organizing committee, ably defined the purpose of the new society. Drexel Institute, in its rôle of host, extended a cordial welcome to the association through Dean Gummere. Dr. Brandt responded happily, on behalf of the society. The business of organization was accomplished with harmony and despatch, and the session closed with an address by Miss Katherine E. Puncheon on the subject, The Liberal Studies in the High School Curriculum. Miss Puncheon's paper, which was a model in its thought and persuasive delivery, voiced a plea for the trained mind first, before the trained hand and the trained eye.

The program of the afternoon meeting included two other strong addresses, by men prominent in lines almost antipodal, it would seem, to those of the classicist. Mr. Alba B. Johnson, President of the Baldwin Locomotive Works, spoke on The Value of the Classics in Modern Life, and President Sharpless of Haverford College, once a teacher of mathematics, in an admirable address on the subject, The Liberal Studies and Vocational Training in American Education, awarded to the classically trained man the palm "in doing things most worth while to humanity". Both these addresses, because of their utter freedom from any 'bread and butter interest', were convincing as no argument of the classical teacher could possibly have been.

During the luncheon hour, one hundred and eighty-two persons availed themselves of the opportunity which was offered to break bread together, thereby promoting that closer acquaintance with one another, without which no organization can serve the best interests of its members. A 'Living Latin' exhibit, arranged by the Classical Department of the Girls' High School, according to the suggestions given in Miss Sabin's Manual, had been placed upon the walls, and afforded a subject for conversation when weightier matters failed. The one address of the noon recess was a brief expression of good wishes from Superintendent Brumbaugh.

To many the most attractive feature of the entire

program was a brilliant lecture by Dr. Walton McDaniel on Pliny and Lake Como. Dr. McDaniel, always witty and delightful, was at his best as he led his audience around Lake Como in a fascinating search for Pliny's villas.

It is with pleasure that we report that one hundred and eighty-eight persons paid dues and joined the Association on the day of the meeting, and that several requests for membership have since been received so that the Society, while yet in its first swaddling-bands, is equipped with twice the strength of a Briareus-omen firmetur. The following officers were elected: President, Dr. Walter Dennison, Swarthmore College; Vice-Presidents, Dr. B. W. Mitchell, Central High School, Mr. Stanley Yarnall, Principal of Friends' School, Germantown; Secretary, Miss Jessie E. Allen, Philadelphia High School for Girls; Treasurer, Dr. George Hadzsits, University of Pennsylvania. Other members of the Executive Committee were Dr. W. H. Appleton, Professor Emeritus, Swarthmore College, Professor W. Baker, Haverford College, Miss Minnie Beckwith, Baldwin School, Dr. F. B. Brandt, School of Pedagogy, Dr. Bessie Burchett, Girls' High School, Professor F. A. Dakin, Haverford School, Dr. Edith Hall, University of Pennsylvania Museum, Professor James Hill, Central High School, Professor Frank Niewig, Southern High School, Miss Mary Swindler, Bryn Mawr College.

JESSIE E. ALLEN, *Secretary*.

REVIEWS

Geschichte der Römischen Literatur. Von Friedrich Leo. Erster Band. Die Archaische Literatur. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung (1913). Pp. IV + 496. 15 Marks, bound¹.

The appearance of a book on Latin literature—or, as he prefers to call it, 'Roman' literature—by Friedrich Leo, the distinguished Professor of Classical Philology at Göttingen, is distinctly an event. For thirty-five years or more Professor Leo has been one of the most capable, diligent, and productive workers in the field of ancient classical literature—more particularly in the Latin branch, but always with the close connection of the Latin and the Greek clearly in view. The list of his previous writings is too long to be cited here, but it shows that he has ranged over the field from beginning to end (from the pre-literary beginnings of comedy to the sixth century Christian poet, Venantius Fortunatus); from border to border (e.g. from *Quaestiones Aristophaneae*, 1873, to *Die Originalität der Römischen Literatur*, 1904); from editions of authors (Plautus, Seneca, and others) to minute investigations of particular literary species (e.g. *Die*

Griechisch-Römische Biographie, 1901; *Der Monolog im Drama*, 1908) and chapters on the history of ancient metric (e.g. *Die Plautinische Cantica und die Hellenistische Lyrik*, 1897; *Der Saturnische Vers*, 1905).¹

A thing that the mere listing of works cannot show, but which is eminently true of Leo's work from beginning to end, is that it is characterized by an obvious impulse to get to the very bottom of things; neglecting no possible source of information, yet subjecting everything to sharp scrutiny and independent judgment; accepting nothing on mere authority; combining scattered, scanty, and often conflicting evidence with rare skill. It is noticeable in this latest volume that, in tracing the development of the early literature, he lays great stress on strong individual personalities, who did not merely drift with the currents of the time, but laid hold of something with individuality and blazed new paths. He is such a personality himself—a true scholar, an investigator, a man with ideas and the ability to develop them into something new and substantial.

The volume under review covers the period from the beginnings to about 90 B.C. and contains, besides a table of contents and two indices, 443 pages of 'history' and 44 pages of illustrative selections from Latin literature in German translations. The historical part falls into nine chapters: I Conditions and Elements of Literary Development in Italy; II Law and Speech; III The Beginnings; IV Naevius; V Plautus; VI Ennius; VII The Successors of Plautus and Ennius; VIII Literature and Roman Culture; IX The Poetry of the Closing Second Century. Each chapter is divided into from three to six numbered sections. Thus, in Chapter I there are three subdivisions: (1) Romans, Greeks, Italians; (2) Greek and Etruscan Culture-Influences; (3) Pre-Literary Remains and Traces. The Saturnian Verse. In Chapter V (Plautus) we have (1) Life; (2) The Attic Comedy; (3) Lyrically Amplified Comedies of Plautus; (4) Amalgamation with the Hellenistic Musical Farce (*Singspiel*); (5) 'Contaminated' Comedies; (6) Style and Art. This list of chapter-headings, with titles of the subordinate divisions in two representative chapters, will serve to show in a general way how the ground is covered. It remains to specify briefly some of the distinctive features of the book.

That the author is master of all the available material, including even the latest papyrus finds, and has prepared himself for the present task by a lifetime of work in the field, producing a multitude of *Vorarbeiten* that are at his command as a partial foundation for the new work, has already been sufficiently indicated. His control of the material naturally includes familiarity with all the secondary literature on the subject, as is abundantly shown on occasion. His work is, however, in no sense or

¹ This article is condensed from a review presented to the Yale Classical Club in November, 1913. Since this article was prepared classical scholarship has suffered a grievous loss in the death of Professor Leo.

degree a summary or compilation of the work of others, with systematic documentation; it is, rather, distinctly and conspicuously a first-hand study of the ancient literature itself, both the Latin and the Greek, with citation of the contributory or conflicting views of other scholars only when, for one reason or another, they are of especial importance.

The writer is not merely learned; he is mentally keen and alert, prolific in fresh ideas, constantly finding new points of view, and abounding in stimulating suggestions. His suggestion of an analogy between the relation of Augustan poetry to Cicero's oratory and that of the earliest literary poetry to the early oratory (p. 33), for example, is illuminating; so, too, his comparison of the work of the early Roman jurists in evolving the fundamental rules of civil intercourse, the conceptions of property rights, etc., with that of the early Greek philosophers in bringing to light the problems of the world and proposing various solutions of them which have continued to be the starting-points for scientific thinking the world over (22).

The style and tone of the book are excellent. The stress throughout is on the thing, rather than on the word. The author is serenely master of his subject and well exemplifies old Cato's rule: *rem tene, verba sequentur*. There is little or no 'fine writing', almost never any obscurity of expression; philosophical abstractions, generalizations unsupported by basic details, and flightiness of any sort are conspicuously lacking. There is no offensive belligerency, but views of other scholars that seem to the author erroneous are calmly passed by or dismissed by him as by one entitled to judge, sometimes with specific reasons given, sometimes not.

Above all, however, the thing that calls for emphasis among the various points of excellence in this book is its general structure. It is not a collection of monographs or loosely connected chapters, but a coherently woven, connected expository narrative. Numerous sections dealing with various general movements, developments, or sets of circumstances or influences are a notable feature of the work. The section on Greek and Etruscan contributions to Roman culture in the pre-literary period (I 2), for example, brings together in a remarkably clear and impressive way the scattered items from all sources (the alphabet, early borrowings of words, Greek elements in Roman law, the earliest public architecture at Rome, Etruscan names in Latin, Rome's acquisition of a dominant position in Latium in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C., intercourse with Cumae, early modifications of the state religion, the upgrowth of a subordinate Greek population at Rome, etc.), and presents within moderate compass a vivid and convincing picture of the whole hinterland of foreign culture-influence at Rome in the early times that

cannot be paralleled elsewhere. In such sections as this Leo's rare skill in combining scattered or scanty details into a substantial whole is particularly noticeable, though this is by no means confined to such more or less general sections, but is everywhere apparent. The sketch of the earliest development of Roman law (II 1), as a preliminary to the section on pre-literary speech (II 2), is masterly; and in the latter section (II 2) the large part played by speaking (in the senate, in the assembly, and in the courts) in the development of the language as a vehicle for artistic expression for at least two centuries before the beginning of the Romano-Greek literature (as the author calls the new literature developed by Livius Andronicus and his successors) is most clearly set forth. The sketch of the later development of the Greek literature and the relation of the Roman literature to the Greek (III 1), presented without any documentation at all, except a single reference to Athenaeus on a specific point, is above praise. One will look in vain elsewhere for any single account, long or short, that presents so clearly this interesting and important subject. First comes a brilliant sketch of the Alexandrian literature (the separation of the particular sciences from philosophy after Aristotle; the development of Alexandria, with its great library, as the new scientific center; the characteristics of the Alexandrian writers and writings; etc.), followed by the observation that this Alexandrian literature, though it subsequently became 'classical' and, as such, exercised much influence on Latin literature at a later time, did not in any way affect or touch the Greek freedman who started the Romano-Greek literature. Then the fact that in the other, older parts of the Greek world (naturally including south Italy) the *Attic* literature everywhere spread and developed is set forth, with details as to the various lines of development, including various lower types of literature, such as the many sorts of popular farces, which were soon to come into account for the Latin literature, though not at the very beginning, in which only the classical Greek poetry played a part. Then follows an interesting contrast of the Hellenistic culture with the Roman character of the time; then a sketch of the influence of Greek slaves and freedmen at Rome from early times, paving the way for the reception of Greek influence on a larger scale after the conquest of South Italy; and finally the stage is set for the coming drama: on the one side the politically dominant Romans, now masters of the whole peninsula and with the spread of the Latin language over the whole of it well under way, on the other side the politically subordinate Greeks, with their culture, art, and language. This is all fine constructive work. The narrative has an almost epic sweep, and could scarcely be surpassed. Among the other topics

treated in sections of similar character to that of those just noticed are the development of Attic comedy (V 2); literary conditions at Rome in the generation after Plautus (VII 1); the permeation of Roman society by Greek culture-influences as bearing upon the beginning of prose literature at Rome, which, unlike the poetical beginnings, sprang not from freedmen or outsiders, but from men of old Roman tradition, who had held high public offices, led Roman armies, and governed peoples (VIII 1); the development of philological study and writing among the Greeks and subsequently, under strong Greek influence, among the Romans (VIII 6); and the development of Latin comedy as a whole (IX 1). Such sections as these serve as a background into which the more particular topics (individual authors, etc.) are nicely fitted; the individual elements in the design are distinctly drawn, but they are likewise effectively combined into a coherent general pattern. If it be the task of classical philology to reconstruct, interpret, and bring vividly before us a connected, organic whole, Leo has certainly contributed largely to the performance of this task in his new book, and particularly so in the sections just noticed and others of similar character. He has thrown light into dark corners, put flesh upon dry bones, and combined details into a clear, vivid, connected account of the general movement and development.

A special word must be said about the treatment of the relations of the Latin literature to the Greek. No other writer has made this important subject so plain in all its details, so far as Professor Leo has gone. He does this partly in occasional sections of a more or less general character, some of which have already been noticed (e.g. I 2, III 1, VIII 6), but also in connection with particular authors. The notable thing in all this is that broad general statements unsupported by detailed basic facts are everywhere avoided, and that there is explicit demonstration of (1) what the Greek contributions were and (2) how the Romans, while freely adopting and adapting from the Greek, yet put their own national stamp on all that they took over or developed. To take a single example, Lucilius is distinctly put—as to subject-matter and tone—in the line of descent from the Greek writers who expressed their personal feelings and thoughts in verse or prose (Hesiod, Archilochus, Hipponax, and other earlier writers, and numerous writers of the Hellenistic period, such as Callimachus, Phoenix, Machon, and Menippus), yet is shown to have developed a literary form (Gattung) that is new and quite his own (IX 3).

One can scarcely close a review of Leo's volume without a word about its relation to rivals in the field, especially Teuffel's and Schanz's books under

the same title, both of which are now appearing in new editions. Leo does not come quite squarely into competition with either of these works. Schanz's book, with its admirably clear, full, and orderly presentation of the subject, taking into account and systematically indexing all the important work of modern scholars in the field, will doubtless continue to be the best *hand-book*—the book to which the student who wishes to orient himself on any particular author or topic, or to get hand-book or bibliographical information in general, will first turn. The new Teuffel (as stated by Kroll in the preface to the second volume) frankly abandons the attempt to combine literary history and full bibliography, by largely cutting down the latter. It will continue to be useful, though distinctly less so than Schanz, for general hand-book purposes, but more particularly, perhaps, for its convenient eidographic section at the beginning and as a corrective or supplement to Schanz. Leo's book, like the new Teuffel, lacks full bibliographical data, and its arrangement is perhaps not quite so systematic and convenient for hand-book purposes as that of either Teuffel or Schanz. It is, rather, primarily a book to be read as a whole than one to be consulted as an encyclopedia or a hand-book. It certainly has its place in one's case of reference-books, but it belongs primarily on the reading-table.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

J. W. D. INGERSOLL.

Cretan Elements in the Cults and Ritual of Apollo.
By Mary Hamilton Swindler. Bryn Mawr College Monographs, Monograph Series, Vol. XIII (1913).

Examining briefly the Cretan boast that their island was the home of religion and of the gods, and reviewing the various and sundry guesses as to the original home and character of Apollo, the author of this dissertation passes on to consider the various Cretan cults which this god drew into his cult.

PYTHIOS.—Several important points in regard to the cult of the Pythian Apollo at Delphi seem to indicate a connection between Crete and Delphi prior to Apollo's seizure of the oracle. Traces of a Minoan settlement at Pytho indicate early relations: legends concerning the founding of the oracle seem to have Minoan characteristics, particularly the goats and the sacred laurel in the temenos at Delphi; and further the fact that Apollo brought from Crete the priests who interpreted his oracle points in the same direction.

DELPHINIOS.—The author believes that this word is from the root *δελφ* through *δελφίς*, 'belly-fish', and that the cult was that of a dolphin god. Cretan origin is argued mainly from the localities where Apollo Delphinios was worshipped, these places being for the most part either Cretan or having Cretan

connections. The story in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo 388 ff., Miss Swindler believes, suggests a Cretan origin for the dolphin god who gave to Delphi its name.

SMINTHEUS.—Cretan origin is indicated for this cult by the tradition that *σμίινθος* was the Cretan word for 'mice' (recent investigators hold that *-νθος* is not Indo-European) and by the relations between Crete and the cult localities, which were notably in Asia Minor.

AMYKLAIOS.—This title of Apollo is derived from a place name and it appears in localities in Crete or influenced therefrom. At Amyklai in Sparta Apollo displaced a non-Greek god Hyakinthos: this name, the nature of the cult of Apollo at Amyklai, and the representation of the god by a semi-aniconic image are taken as evidence that Apollo appropriated a Mycenaean (probably Cretan) cult.

For several other cults such as are indicated by the titles Agyieus, Tarrhaïos, etc., Cretan origin is also maintained.

Chapter III discusses cathartic elements. Historically rites of purification seem to have begun in Greece proper in the eighth century, and the cathartic ritual was particularly associated with chthonian powers: in connection with Olympians it showed itself in the cults of Apollo, Zeus, and Dionysus. Crete and Delphi were important centers of purification, and Epimenides played a large part in the spread of these rites from Crete. The legend of Karmanor and the story of the founding of the Delphinion at Athens seem to give reason for believing that Crete was the place whence the cathartic ritual spread.

Musical elements derived from Crete are discussed in Chapter IV. Devotion to music and dancing was traditional in the reputation of Crete: there is definite evidence that the hyporcheme was native to the island and of great antiquity. This was one of the earliest musical forms taken over into the ritual of Apollo. The conclusion that the nome originated in Crete is an inference from the legend of Chrysothemis singing it at Delphi; that one division of the nome was called *δμφαλος* connects the nome with that oracle prior to Apollo's possession, and so perhaps with Crete. According to ancient tradition the paeon came from Crete, and it seems to have become associated with the worship of Apollo at Amyklai, Delos and Delphi.

A brief summary such as the above can indicate only vaguely the contents of this dissertation, and of course can give no intimation of the amount of material presented as evidence. The evidential matter is often involved in traditions and the argument consists in large part of the accumulation of probabilities; this hazardous method Miss Swindler has used deftly and without claiming the certainty of mathematical proof. This is not the last word on

the relations between Crete and the worship of Apollo, but it gathers together many pieces of evidence which in total have appreciable weight. The conclusions Miss Swindler has sought to establish will win varying degrees of approval with different readers—varying largely in accord with their opinions as to the evidential value of traditions—, but all will appreciate the careful and temperate mode of presenting the results of a careful investigation.

TRINITY COLLEGE.

LEROY CARR BARRET.

Elements of Latin. By Barry C. Smith. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co. (1913). Pp. ix + 352.

Of the making of many books there is no end. This is also true of First Year Latin books. The book before us is very concise; there is nothing superfluous in it, but it is equally true that there is nothing omitted that should be included. It follows Professor Bennett's idea of developing the forms logically and thoroughly before proceeding to the study of syntax, and this is done in an orderly and systematic way, as will be shown by the fact that the Third Declension comes as early as Lesson VII.

With so many beginners' Latin books on the market, it is hard to introduce many new or original features; but the Word List for drill at the end of the book is one of these; and the arrangement—purely a typographical one—of the separate verb-forms and shorter sentences for translation in columns instead of in lines is admirable. In this way the pupils can follow the reciter more readily without losing themselves in a welter of type. In format the book is very well done, with a clear, open page, and plain attractive type with few notes in italics or smaller print. I could wish to see in the Vocabularies more suggestions as to English derivatives and a closer connection established throughout the book between English and Latin constructions. This is a part of our study of Latin that is too much neglected: English and Latin should be made to help each other. Personally I think it a mistake to give special meanings to the subjunctives in the paradigm, as Mr. Smith does. Students get an idea from this of a stereotyped translation for the subjunctive instead of learning that the translation of the subjunctive depends on the context.

There seems to be a slight inconsistency in the statement about *alterius*. Mr. Smith says of the nine pronominal adjectives that the genitive ends in *ius*, except that *alter* generally has *alterius* in poetry; he then proceeds to decline it—correctly of course—as *alterius*. There is no necessity for the statement about *alterius*. But these are minor matters.

The book is remarkably free from errors. I have discovered not a single typographical error or false quantity, and this is rather rare in a first edition.

The book shows evidence of careful editing, and the publishers have done their work well.

FRANCIS H. LEE.

CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL, PHILADELPHIA.

NOTE ON AENEID 2.86-87

mc.....
..... pater primis huc misit ab annis.

This passage is generally taken, together with 2.137-138, *nec mihi iam patriam antiquam spes ulla videndi nec dulcis natos*, to constitute one of the inconsistencies of Vergil. The inconsistency arises from the traditional interpretation of *primis ab annis* as 'from my earliest years', since to one of tender years the *natos* of 138 were an impossibility. But *primis ab annis*, interpreted as 'from my earliest years', is equally inconsistent with *et nos aliquod nomen decusque gessimus*, a sentence uttered in the same breath. Now, Vergil was at least sane; and so, even though we may imagine him unable to hold the thread of his discourse through the fifty lines between 87 and 137, it is inconceivable that he should have been guilty of ridiculous inconsistency in two successive sentences. All inconsistency disappears if we interpret thus, *primis ab annis (belli)*, 'from the earliest years (of the war)', and make the passage refer to Sinon's continuous absence from home since the beginning of the campaign. For the omission of the modifying word *belli*, a word required by the plain sense of the passage and by the necessary demands of consistency and intelligibility, compare Aeneid 1.345-346 *primisque iugarat ominibus*; there the necessities of the case require the supplying of *nuptialibus* with *ominibus* no more imperatively than *belli* is required with *primis ab annis*.

B. W. MITCHELL.

CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL, Philadelphia.

Among recent additions to the Loeb Classical Library three should be of special interest to our readers. Professor C. E. Bennett has translated the Odes and Epodes of Horace. Professor Rolfe has issued the first volume of his translation of Suetonius; this carries the reader through the Life of Caligula. The introductory matter in this volume is exceptionally full and good; in most of the volumes of this Library the Introductions have been so meager as to be practically negligible. Professor Walter Miller, of the University of Missouri, has translated the *De Officiis* of Cicero. All three books have, rightly, been well received by the reviewers. In this Library, again, Ernest Cary has brought out the first of the nine volumes of his revision of H. B. Foster's translation of Dio Cassius's History of Rome. Less satisfactory is the volume containing Mr. Heseltine's translation of Petronius and Dr. Rouse's rendering of the Apocolocyntosis of Seneca.

C. K.

Dr. Guy Blandin Colburn of the University of Missouri calls our attention to the fact that in his Early Memories 184-186 Senator Henry Cabot Lodge laments the liberty of election of studies that gave scope to his youthful inertia, and declares that of the so-called substitutes for the Classics which he took he has forgotten even the names.

CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

- American Schoolmaster—Jan., The Social Argument for the Study of the Classics, O. O. Norris.
- Athenaeum—Feb. 14, Dramatic Gossip—Euripides' Trojan Women (Murray's trans.) at the People's Free Theatre; Feb. 21, Two Verse Translations of the Classics (Taylor's Odes of Horace and Way's Sophocles); Feb. 28, Dramatic Gossip—The Acharnians of Aristophanes at Oxford; March 7, Fine Arts—(Weller, Athens and its Monuments).
- Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art—March, Department of Classical Art, Accessions of 1913 (an important article, well illustrated).
- Century—Feb., Growing Old Disgracefully (parody of Horace, Ode 15, Book 3), Louis Untermeyer.
- Dial—March 1, Latitude in Latin Pronunciation (editorial comment): Records of Ancient Greece, J. R. Smith.
- Educational Review—March, Greek at Princeton, A. F. West.
- Independent—Feb. 23, Three Prayers to Ceres, Freda Kirchwey (a poem); March 2, Prehistoric Civilization.
- Nation (London)—Feb. 21, A Roman Decadent (Petronius); Feb. 28, The Great African (St. Augustine).
- Nation (New York)—March 19, The Spirit of Modern Greece (Manatt, Aegean Days).
- North American Review—March, The Sea in the Greek Poets, W. C. Greene (this essay won the Charles Oldham Prize at Oxford, June 1913).
- Open Court—March, A Word about Greek Women, H. D. Jenkins.
- Outlook—Feb. 14, Old Rome; March 14, (Percy Gardner, Principles of Greek Art).
- Records of the Past—Jan.-Feb., Pompeii: The Aqueducts of Ancient Rome: Inscription Recording a Sea Fight in the Hellespont.
- Revue historique—March-April, Bulletin historique—Antiquités latines, publications étrangères, Ch. Lécirvain; Comptes-rendus critiques—(Laqueur, Polybius, Ch. Lécirvain).
- Saturday Review—Feb. 7, Socrates and a Minimum Wage, A. D. Godley; Alceste (Verrall, Euripides the Rationalist); Feb. 14, The Golden Bough Full Foliaged (Frazer, The Golden Bough, Pt. 7, Balder the Beautiful, etc.); Feb. 21, Sappho, A. C. Swinburne: One of the Great Books of the World (Holmes, Caesar De Bello Gallico).
- School Review—Feb., W. L. Westermann, The Story of the Ancient Nations (Ethel E. Beers).
- Scientific American Supplement—Feb. 28, The Arms of the Venus of Milo, the End of a Mystery (Aicard, Le Roman d'une statue); March 7, Greek Animal Drawings, the Studies of Morin-Jean, Alfred Emerson (ill.).
- Spectator—Feb. 7, Correspondence—Mr. Blakeney's Iliad; Feb. 28, Letters to the Editor—Cicero and the Deportations, E. H. Blakeney: Books—The Letters of Erasmus (Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Rotterodami, ed. P. C. Allen, vol. 3).
- Times (London) Weekly Ed., Lit. Supplement—Feb. 6, A Naturalist on the Georgics (Royds, The Beasts, Birds, and Bees of Virgil).
- Times (London) Educational Supplement—Feb. 4, Correspondence—The Retention of the Classics, A Reply to Sir Frederic Kenyon, A. C. Benson: The Value of Greek, A. Hassall: Classical Reading in Middle Life, G. H. Skipwith: Latin and Modern Usage, C. Exon: The Pronunciation of Latin, A. C. G. Heygate: A Continental View, F. E. Freese; March 3, Correspondence—The Classics in Youth and Age, T. L. Papillon: Classical Reading in Middle Life, W. L. Paine: A Recreation and a Joy, "Tivoli": The Pronunciation of Latin, J. R. Blakiston: The Choice of Books—(C. Julii Caesaris Commentarii, ed. T. Rice Holmes).